

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The undersigned attorney of record thanks the Examiner for the privilege of the telephonic interview conducted June 1, 2006, and for entry of the amendment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.116 filed on April 27, 2006. As discussed in the telephonic interview, Applicants provide the present amendment in connection with a Request for Continued Examination in an effort to more particularly point out the invention.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended, as suggested in the telephonic interview of June 1, 2006, to clarify that each of the EDFA gain portions of the plurality of Raman assisted EDFA hybrid amplifiers has “substantially the same total input power as each of the others of said EDFA gain portions of said plurality of Raman assisted EDFA hybrid amplifiers” No new matter has been added.

35 USC §103

The arguments made in the Amendment Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.116 filed on April 27, 2006 are incorporated herein by reference. In general, in a system consistent with the claimed invention each of the plurality of Raman assisted EDFA hybrid amplifiers has (1) a Raman amplifier variable gain portion, an (2) EDFA gain portion. The gain of each Raman amplifier variable gain portion is set so that all of the plurality of EDFA gain portions (e.g. the EDFA gain portions associated with each of hybrid amplifiers 12-1, 12-2...12-N) have substantially the same input power, regardless of the span length and loss associated with the amplifier.

Applicants find nothing in Onaka that teaches to control each of a plurality of Raman variable gain portions to provide an “associated gain” whereby each of a plurality of associated EDFA gain portions has “substantially the same total input power as each of the others of said EDFA gain portions of said plurality of Raman assisted EDFA hybrid amplifiers”, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 26. In fact, the Advisory action dated May 11, 2006 does not even argue that these limitations are taught or suggested by Onaka. The Advisory action only argues

that Onaka teaches to provide a single EDFA with constant input power. There is nothing in Onaka that suggests that the EDFA portions of a plurality of Raman assisted EDFA hybrid amplifiers have substantially the same total input power, as claimed. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 15 and 26-27 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Onaka et al. be withdrawn upon reconsideration.

In light of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the presently pending claims are in a condition for allowance. Entry of the present amendment and allowance of the application is respectfully requested. In the event the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in disposition of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at (603) 668-6560.

No additional fees are believed to be due. In the event there are any fee deficiencies, please charge them (or credit any overpayment) to our Deposit Account No. 50-2121.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald J. Perreault/

Donald J. Perreault, Reg. No. 40,126
Attorney for Applicants
GROSSMAN, TUCKER, PERREAULT
& PFLEGER, PLLC
55 South Commercial Street
Manchester, NH 03101
Ph: 603-668-6560
Fx: 603-668-2970